

APR. 14. 2005 11:28AM AVENTIS US PAT DEPT
TO: US CENTRALIZED USPTO

NO. 4374 P. 1

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages In This Submission

5

Application Number

10/736,801

Filing Date

December 16, 2003

RECEIVED

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

First Named Inventor

Bert KLEBL et al.

Art Unit

1632

Examiner Name

J. Hama

APR 14 2005

Attorney Docket Number

DEAV2002/0089 US NP

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- Fee Transmittal Form
 Fee Attached
 Amendment/Reply
 After Final
 Affidavits/declaration(s)
 Extension of Time Request
 Express Abandonment Request
 Information Disclosure Statement
 Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
 Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
 Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.63

- Drawing(s)
 Licensing-related Papers
 Petition
 Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
 Power of Attorney, Revocation
 Change of Correspondence Address
 Terminal Disclaimer
 Request for Refund
 CD, Number of CD(s) _____
 Landscape Table on CD

Remarks

After Allowance Communication to TC

Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences

Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)

Proprietary Information

Status Letter

Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name

sanofi-aventis

Signature

Karen Krupen

Printed name

Karen I. Krupen

Date

April 14, 2005

Reg. No.

34,647

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: (USPTO FAX NO. 703-872-9306 ; Total No. of Pages Transmitted: 5)

Signature

Delia Coughlin

Typed or printed name

Delia Coughlin

Date

April 14, 2005

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICEIn re Application of
Klebl et al.

Application No.: 10/736,801

Examiner: J. HAMA

Art Unit: 1632

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 14 2005

Filed: December 16, 2003

Title: **METHOD FOR GENERATING A
GENETICALLY MODIFIED
ORGANISM**

TELEFAX CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
transmitted via facsimile 703-872-9306 to the
Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313, on

April 14, 2005

Date of Transmission

Signature

AMENDMENTCommissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action of February 24, 2005, the time to respond to which has been extended one month to April 24, 2005, the Applicants respond to the Restriction Requirement by provisionally electing to prosecute Group I, claims 1-21, directed to a method of generating a genetically modified organism for drug screening comprising the steps of, *inter alia*, analyzing the modified gene expression (i.e., mRNA) pattern and identifying compensatingly differentially regulated genes. They respectfully disagree, however, that the restriction requirement dividing groups I and II is improper, and ask that the Examiner reconsider it.

The Examiner argues that Inventions I (the mRNA expression method) and II (the protein expression method) are unrelated because a method for generating a genetically modified organism for drug screening comprising a step for measuring mRNA expression is materially and methodically different from the same method wherein protein expression measured. The Examiner further states that Invention I does not depend on Invention II to function and vice versa.

The Examiner's restriction requirement ignores the fact that when protein expression analysis is measured, it is accompanied by mRNA expression analysis because mRNA